

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Official Action dated September 26, 2003. Claims 1-11 have been amended and new Claims 12-20 have been added. The application now includes Claims 1-20 with Claims 1, 5 and 7 being the only independent claims. Favorable reconsideration, in view of the above amendments and accompanying remarks, is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 2 of the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 4-5, 7, 9 and 11 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,807,682 to Catinella et al. In paragraph 4 of the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 3,6,8 and 10 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,807,682 to Catinella et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,245,277 to Diamond. These rejections are respectfully traversed in light of the amendments to the claims.

As amended, Claim 1 defines the invention as a manually operated extraction device for use in a casting apparatus to remove a stuck cast part, the casting apparatus including a moveable mold section and a stationary mold section so that when the moveable mold section is in a closed position and in contact with the stationary mold section a part shape cavity is defined. The manually operated extraction device includes a manually operated extraction member disposed in the stationary mold section during the casting of a cast part. Claim 1 recites that the extraction member is disposed adjacent the part shape cavity and selectively moveable between a first position, wherein the manually operated extraction member cooperates with the mold sections to form a part of the part shape cavity, and a second position, wherein the manually operated extraction member is operative to engage and eject the stuck cast part from the stationary mold section of the part shape cavity. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests such a manually operated extraction device as recited in Claim 1.

U.S. Patent No. 3,807,682 to Catinella et al. discloses an accelerated knock-out (22) which, is actuated automatically during each cycle as part of the normal operation of the machine, so as to eject or knock out the molded part (17) from the moveable mold block (11) of the machine. Thus, Catinella et al. only discloses an automatic knock-out (22) for ejecting a part from the moveable block during the normal operation of the machine, i.e., during each cycle of the movement of the moveable block of the machine. The knock-out (22) in Catinella et al. would not operate or function as intended if the block (11) did not move. There is no teaching or suggestion in Catinella et al. as providing a “knock-out” for ejecting a stuck part from the stationary block, i.e., block (12) in Catinella et al. Thus, Catinella et al. does not disclose or suggest a knock-out/extraction member which can be operated when it is desired to remove a stuck cast part from the stationary mold section of the machine, i.e., mold block (12) in Catinella et al., as recited in Claim 1. The present invention clearly relates to an extraction member which can be operated to remove a stuck cast part from the stationary mold section of the casting apparatus. Specifically, Claim 1 recites that the manually operated extraction member is disposed in the stationary mold section during the casting of a cast part and is selectively moveable between a first position, wherein the manually operated extraction member cooperates with the mold sections to form a part of the part shape cavity, and a second position, wherein the manually operated extraction member is operative to engage and eject the stuck cast part from the stationary mold section of the part shape cavity. Thus, it is believed that Claim 1, along with dependent Claims 2-4 and 12-13, are patentable over the cited references.

Claim 5 has been amended in a manner similar to Claim 1. Thus, for those reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1, it is believed that Claim 5, along with dependent Claims 6 and 14-16, are patentable over the prior art references.

Claim 7 has been amended in a manner similar to Claim 1. Thus, for those reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1, it is believed that Claim 7, along with dependent Claims 8-11 and 17-20, are patentable over the prior art references.

In view of the above amendments and accompanying remarks, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner does not believe that the above amendments to the claims place the application in condition for allowance, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to discuss the application and the prior art references prior to the issuance of a final action by the Examiner.